1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT	
8	FOR THE WESTERN DIS	STRICT OF WASHINGTON	
9	AT SEATTLE		
10			
11	BOFI FEDERAL BANK, a federally chartered	No.	
12	banking institution,	COMPLAINT FOR TORTIOUS	
13	Plaintiff,	INTERFERENCE WITH CONTRACT, UNJUST ENRICHMENT, DECLARATORY	
14	VS.	RELIEF AND JURY DEMAND	
15	ADVANCE FUNDING, LLC, KIRK A. TOVEY, individually and as trustee of the KIRK A. TOVEY REVOCABLE TRUST,		
16	and SETTLEMENT COLLECTION		
17	SERVICE, LLC.		
18	Defendants.		
19			
20	COMES NOW Plaintiff, BOFI FEDERAL BANK, by and through its attorneys, Kathleen		
21	Nelson of Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith, and complains and alleges against the above named		
22	defendants as follows:		
23		RTIES	
24		ofI") is a federally chartered banking institution	
25	with its principal place of business located at 4350 La Jolla Village Drive, Suite 140, San Diego,		
26	CA 92122.		
27		Defendant Advance Funding, LLC ("Advance	
	Funding") is a New York registered limited	liability company engaged in the business of	
	COMPLAINT I	LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP	

LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP 2101 Fourth Avenue, Suite 700 Seattle, Washington 98121 206-436-2020 purchasing state lottery prize payments from state lottery winners, with its principal place of business located at 48 Wall Street, 11th Floor, New York, New York, 10005.

- 1.3 Upon information and belief, Defendant Kirk A. Tovey is an individual who resides in Jacksonville Beach, Florida and is trustee of the Kirk A. Tovey Revocable Trust, which is the assignee of record of Advance Funding's rights under a certain Lottery Prize Assignment Agreement, between Sheena Venzant ("Venzant") and Advance Funding, dated May 17, 2013, and the assignee of record to the lottery prize payments described in paragraph 3.10.
- 1.4 Upon information and belief, Defendant Settlement Collection Service, LLC ("Settlement Collection") is the current owner of that certain Reliastar Life Insurance Company life insurance policy, measuring the life of Sheena Venzant, and bearing policy number AD20532551. Upon information and belief, Settlement Collection is a Florida registered limited liability company with principal place of business located at 3333 Atlantic Blvd., Jacksonville, FL 32207.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 2.1 This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this lawsuit and of the parties hereto pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332 because the parties are citizens of different states, and the matter in controversy exceeds the sum of \$75,000.
- 2.2 Venue is properly laid in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 as the events giving rise to this action occurred in the counties served by the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington.

III. RELEVANT FACTS

- 3.1 On or about November 16, 2011, Venzant won \$1,000 a week for life in the Washington State Lucky for Life Lottery Drawing ("Washington Lottery"), payable in annual installment payments in the amount of Fifty-Two Thousand Dollars (\$52,000.00) each for the rest of her life (the "Installments").
- 3.2 On or about March 7, 2012, Venzant entered into a written Lottery Payment Assignment Agreement with BofI (the "BofI Agreement"), whereby Venzant agreed to and did

assign to BofI the right to accept and purchase a portion of certain of the Installments. A Terms Rider was attached to the BofI Agreement, detailing the assigned payments of Fifty-Two Thousand Dollars (\$52,000.00) in nineteen (19) annual payments, commencing on November 16, 2012 and continuing until November 16, 2030.

- 3.3 That same day, Venzant and BofI executed a Life Contingent Payment Addendum ("Addendum"), which modified the assigned payments to twenty-five (25) annual payments in the amount of Forty-Seven Thousand Dollars (\$47,000.00) each, commencing November 16, 2012 and continuing until November 16, 2036, and clarified that the lottery winnings were payable in life contingent annual installments.
- 3.4 Additionally, in the Addendum, BofI and Venzant acknowledged that a policy of life insurance was necessary in order to protect BofI in the event of Venzant's demise prior to BofI's collection of all installments purchased. Venzant further acknowledged and agreed that BofI would be the owner and sole beneficiary of the life insurance policy, and disclaimed and waived any rights to the policy or to the proceeds thereof.
- 3.5 On or about March 9, 2012 and March 14, 2012, pursuant to the Uniform Commercial Code, Revised Article 9, Plaintiff BofI caused to be filed a Uniform Commercial Code Financing Statement and Uniform Commercial Code Financing Statement Amendment, respectively, thereby providing public notice of the BofI Agreement.
- 3.6 Shortly thereafter, in furtherance of the Bofl Agreement and Addendum, Bofl introduced Venzant to insurance brokerage firm, The Meltzer Group, so that she may obtain a life insurance policy.
- 3.7 On or about June 20, 2012, Reliastar Life Insurance Company issued to Venzant life insurance policy number AD20532551, which measured the life of Venzant and listed Venzant as the owner of the policy (the "Policy").
- 3.8 The Policy featured a two-year contestability period. Venzant agreed that BofI would file a petition seeking approval of the BofI Agreement after the expiration of the contestability period.

- 3.9 During the contestability period, BofI provided Venzant several advances. In total, BofI advanced to Venzant the sum of \$15,000.
- 3.10 Without BofI's knowledge and notwithstanding the valid contract between BofI and Venzant, on or about May 17, 2013, Venzant and Advance Funding entered into a Lottery Prize Assignment Agreement, wherein Venzant assigned to Advance Funding the vast majority of the same payments that she had already assigned to BofI, to wit, twenty (20) annual payments in the amount of Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$50,000) each, commencing on November 16, 2013 and continuing until November 16, 2032 (the "AF Agreement").
- 3.11 Shortly thereafter, without providing notice to Bofl even though Bofl was clearly an indispensable party under CR 19 given that Bofl, pursuant to the Bofl Agreement, had an interest in the vast majority of the payments Advance Funding was seeking to purchase from Venzant, Advance Funding filed a petition in the Superior Court of Washington in Thurston County seeking approval of the assignment in the AF Agreement (the "Transfer Action").
- 3.12 On or about June 14, 2013, without BofI's knowledge and notwithstanding the valid contract between BofI and Venzant, an Order Granting Petition and Approving Lottery Prize Assignment was filed, which granted the AF Petition, and allowed Advance Funding to further assign the payments to the Kirk A. Tovey Revocable Trust (the "Court Order"). Indeed, upon information and belief, the Court was intentionally never apprised by Advance Funding of BofI's rights and interests to the vast majority of the payments Advance Funding was seeking to purchase from Venzant.
- 3.13 At or around this time, upon information and belief, Venzant changed the owner of the Policy to Settlement Collection, despite having no legal or other rights to the Policy given that she acknowledged and agreed that BofI was the owner and sole beneficiary of the Policy, and disclaimed and waived any rights to the Policy or to the proceeds thereof.

IV. COUNT 1 – TORTIOUS INTERFERENCE WITH CONTRACT

4.1 BofI incorporates by reference each and every paragraph above as if fully set forth herein.

- 4.2 Boff had a valid and enforceable contractual relationship with Venzant, as set forth in the Boff Agreement and the Addendum and as provided under Washington law. Pursuant to RCW §67.70.100, Venzant had no right of cancellation of the Boff Agreement.
- 4.3 The Defendants knew, or should have known, through diligent business practices, oral and/or written notification, constructive notification of public filing of a Uniform Commercial Code financing statement, or from Uniform Commercial Code searches, that BofI had a valid and enforceable contractual relationship with Venzant. Indeed, Advance Funding is actively engaged in purchasing lottery payments in Washington, pursuant to RCW §67.70.100, and the Defendants have collectively filed hundreds of Uniform Commercial Code financing statements, thereby confirming that knowledge is properly imputed to the Defendants.
- 4.4 The Defendants intentionally, willfully and improperly interfered with the contractual relationship between BofI and Venzant for the purpose of inducing Venzant to breach the contractual obligations contained in the BofI Agreement and the Addendum and to enter into an agreement with Advance Funding.
- 4.5 The Defendants' intentional and willful interference with the BofI Agreement was without privilege.
- 4.6 The Defendants' intentional and willful interference with the BofI Agreement was solely for their economic benefit.
- 4.7 The Defendants' tortious interference with BofI's contractual relationship was done with actual malice toward BofI and/or amounted to a willful and wanton disregard for BofI's rights, and was improper in motive.
- 4.8 The Defendants' illegal, intentional and malicious conduct induced Venzant to breach her obligations under the BofI Agreement and the Addendum and to enter into an agreement with Advance Funding solely for their economic benefit.
- 4.9 The Defendants' conduct caused BofI to suffer damages, including monetary damages well in excess of Seventy-Five Thousand Dollars (\$75,000), for which the Defendants are liable.

V. COUNT II - UNJUST ENRICHMENT

- 5.1 BofI incorporates by reference each and every paragraph above as if fully set forth herein.
- 5.2 The AF Agreement, the Court Order, the assignment of payments from Venzant to Advance Funding and then to the Kirk A. Tovey Revocable Trust, the transfer of ownership in the Policy and the above-described course of conduct of the Defendants conferred a benefit on the Defendants.
- 5.3 The Defendants knew they were receiving value from the AF Agreement, the Court Order, the assignment of payments from Venzant to Advance Funding and then to the Kirk A. Tovey Revocable Trust, the transfer of ownership in the Policy and their above-described course of conduct.
- 5.4 The Defendants knew, or should have known, through diligent business practices, oral and/or written notification, constructive notification of public filing of a Uniform Commercial Code financing statement, or from Uniform Commercial Code searches, that the vast majority of the value they received belonged to BofI, as the BofI Agreement and Addendum covered the vast majority of the same payments that Venzant assigned to Advance Funding. Indeed, Advance Funding is actively engaged in purchasing lottery payments in Washington, pursuant to RCW \§67.70.100, and the Defendants have collectively filed hundreds of Uniform Commercial Code financing statements, thereby confirming that knowledge is properly imputed to the Defendants.
- 5.5 By reason of the foregoing, the Defendants have been unjustly enriched at BofI's expense.
- 5.6 The circumstances make it unjust for Defendants to retain the benefits conferred upon them without payment to the party unjustly enriched.
- 5.6 As the party unjustly enriched, the Defendants are equitably obligated to compensate BofI for the improper benefits they received.

VI. COUNT III - DECLARATORY RELIEF

6.1 An actual controversy exists between BofI and the Defendants as to the ownership

1	and the benefici	ial interest in the Policy, given that Venzant had no legal or other right to transfer
2	ownership of the Policy and/or change the beneficiary since she acknowledged and agreed that	
3	BofI was the owner and sole beneficiary of the Policy, and disclaimed and waived any rights to the	
4	Policy or to the proceeds thereof.	
5	6.2 An actual controversy also exists between BofI and the Defendants as to the	
6	validity of the Court Order given the fact that (i) Venzant had already sold to BofI, pursuant to the	
7	BofI Agreement, the vast majority of the payments Advance Funding was seeking to purchase	
8	from Venzant; and (ii) Advance Funding did not provide notice of the Transfer Action to BofI	
9	even though Bot	fI was clearly an indispensable party under CR 19.
10	6.2 B	BofI is entitled to a declaratory judgment from this Court setting forth and
11	decreeing (i) tha	at it is the rightful owner and beneficiary of the Policy, and (ii) that the Court Order
12	is invalid, and therefore, should be vacated and set aside.	
13		VII. JURY DEMAND
14	7.1 B	3 BofI hereby requests a jury for the trial of this matter pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 38
17	/.1	both hereby requests a jury for the trial of this matter pursuant to red. K. Civ. F. 38
15	and CR 38.	soft hereby requests a jury for the trial of this matter pursuant to red. R. Civ. r. 38
		VIII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF
15	and CR 38.	
15 16	and CR 38.	VIII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF
15 16 17	and CR 38. 8.1 P with a contract.	VIII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF
15 16 17 18	and CR 38. 8.1 P with a contract. 8.2 P	VIII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF Plaintiff prays for money damages from the Defendants for tortious interference
15 16 17 18 19	and CR 38. 8.1 P with a contract. 8.2 P received through	VIII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF Plaintiff prays for money damages from the Defendants for tortious interference Plaintiff prays for money damages from Defendants for the improper benefits
15 16 17 18 19 20	and CR 38. 8.1 P with a contract. 8.2 P received through 8.3 P	VIII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF Plaintiff prays for money damages from the Defendants for tortious interference Plaintiff prays for money damages from Defendants for the improper benefits In unjust enrichment.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	and CR 38. 8.1 P with a contract. 8.2 P received through 8.3 P but not limited	VIII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF Plaintiff prays for money damages from the Defendants for tortious interference Plaintiff prays for money damages from Defendants for the improper benefits in unjust enrichment. Plaintiff prays for declaratory relief consistent with the pleadings herein, including
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and CR 38. 8.1 P with a contract. 8.2 P received through 8.3 P but not limited declaration that the	VIII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF Plaintiff prays for money damages from the Defendants for tortious interference Plaintiff prays for money damages from Defendants for the improper benefits In unjust enrichment. Plaintiff prays for declaratory relief consistent with the pleadings herein, including to, a declaration that BofI is the owner and beneficiary of the Policy, and a
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and CR 38. 8.1 P with a contract. 8.2 P received through 8.3 P but not limited declaration that the	VIII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF Plaintiff prays for money damages from the Defendants for tortious interference Plaintiff prays for money damages from Defendants for the improper benefits In unjust enrichment. Plaintiff prays for declaratory relief consistent with the pleadings herein, including Ito, a declaration that BofI is the owner and beneficiary of the Policy, and a Ithe Court Order is invalid and should be vacated and set aside. Plaintiff prays for prejudgment interest at the highest allowable rate on all
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and CR 38. 8.1 P with a contract. 8.2 P received through 8.3 P but not limited declaration that to 8.4 P liquidated amount	VIII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF Plaintiff prays for money damages from the Defendants for tortious interference Plaintiff prays for money damages from Defendants for the improper benefits In unjust enrichment. Plaintiff prays for declaratory relief consistent with the pleadings herein, including Ito, a declaration that BofI is the owner and beneficiary of the Policy, and a Ithe Court Order is invalid and should be vacated and set aside. Plaintiff prays for prejudgment interest at the highest allowable rate on all
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	and CR 38. 8.1 P with a contract. 8.2 P received through 8.3 P but not limited declaration that the second seco	VIII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF Plaintiff prays for money damages from the Defendants for tortious interference Plaintiff prays for money damages from Defendants for the improper benefits In unjust enrichment. Plaintiff prays for declaratory relief consistent with the pleadings herein, including Ito, a declaration that BofI is the owner and beneficiary of the Policy, and a Ithe Court Order is invalid and should be vacated and set aside. Plaintiff prays for prejudgment interest at the highest allowable rate on all Ints.

Case 2:14-cv-00484-BJR Document 1 Filed 04/02/14 Page 8 of 8

LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP

Kathleen A. Nelson, WA Bar No.
2101 Fourth Avenue, Suite 700
Seattle, Washington 98121
Attorneys for Plaintiff Bofl Federral Bank

COMPLAINT 8